UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/768,967	01/30/2004	Sven Schwerin-Wenzel	14413-027001 / 2003P00109	4556
54975 HOLLAND & I	7590 05/09/200 KNIGHT LLP	EXAMINER		
10 ST. JAMES		TANK, ANDREW L		
11th Floor BOSTON, MA	02116-3889		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ŕ			2175	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/768,967	SCHWERIN-WENZEL ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Andrew Tank	2175		

	Andrew Tank	2175	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>23 April 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI		-	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi ral (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	cauco
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	sideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mnliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		impliante / timoriamont (1	102 02 1).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected it Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3-26</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Kieu D Vu/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2175	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: With regards to the amendments of independent claims 1, 3, 8, 11, 18 and 22 to include the element "consolidating customer accounts wherein consolidating inculdes matching one ore more customer accounts of the organizations", the Examiner notes that the amendment of this limitations raises new issues with claims 1, 3, 8, 11, 18 and 22 and their respective dependent claims thereby requring further consideration of the claims..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With regards to Applicant's argument of the merits of claim 6 and 15, in particular, the argument that "Marpe does not inherently or implicitly disclose the 'matching' element", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As cited in the Final Rejection of November 26, 2007, Marpe discloses tracking customer issues in a merger, as Marpe's invention is implemented in databases, it is inherent to the system of Marpe that in order to track and identify a customer issue, a database query must be used, i.e. 'matching'.

With regards to Applicant's argument of the merits of claim 17, the examiner respectfully disargrees and refers Applicant to the rejection and response to arguments as presented in the Final Rejection of November 26, 2007.